UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
AND
SOCIAL COUNCIL

GENERAL

UNESCO/SS/CONF.URB/10
E/CN.11/URB/10
18 July 1956

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION

JOINT UN/UNESCO SEMINAR ON URBANIZATION IN THE ECAFE REGION

Jointly sponsored by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, the United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs and the Secretariat of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, in co-operation with the International Labour Office

8-18 August 1956
Bangkok, Thailand

WORLD AND ASIAN URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction to Seminar on Urbanization in the ECAFE Region

Philip M. Hauser, Rapporteur
(Professor of Sociology
University of Chicago)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
THE GROWTH OF CITIES	3
General Historical	3
Statistics on Growth	5
DEFINITION OF TERMS	14
URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	16
Economic Stages and Settlement	17
Industrialization and Urbanism Stages	18
The pre-industrial city	18
The industrial urban center	20
The metropolitan city	21
Systems of cities	22
Urbanization and Economic Development--Summary	23
URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO SOCIAL CHANGE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS	26
Community and Society	26
Urbanism as Way of Life	27
The Family	30
Social Disorganization	31
Physical Problems--Housing	32
Population Growth	34
Diffusion of Urbanism	34
Urbanization and Social Change--Summary	35
IMPLICATIONS FOR ASIA	37
Differences Between Asia and West	37
Colonial heritage	37
Central planning vs. market mechanism	39
20th century technology	40
Population in relation to resources	41
Ideology and values	41
World situation	42
Concluding Observations	42
FOOTNOTES	46

WORLD AND ASIAN URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction to Seminar on Urbanization in the ECAFE Region

Philip M. Hauser, Rapporteur
(Professor of Sociology
University of Chicago)

The city which is often described both as an antecedent and consequent of modern western civilization also existed in antiquity and, as evidenced by this Seminar itself, is an important element in the societies of Asia and the Far East. In fact, Asia in 1950, had more cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants and a larger population living in them than either Europe or North America.[1] In 1950, out of an estimated total of 866 cities with 100,000 or more inhabitants, Asia had 289, Europe 261 and North America (north of the Rio Grande) 116. Cities with 100,000 persons or more throughout the world contained an estimated 314 million inhabitants of whom 106 million, about one-third lived in Asia; 83 million or somewhat more than one-fourth lived in Europe; and 48 million or about one-seventh lived in North America (north of the Rio Grande).

THE GROWTH OF CITIES

General Historical

The origin of the city, a relatively large population agglomeration, as a form of human settlement is not known. There has been considerable speculation, however, about its origin based in part on archaeology, in part on legend and myth, and in part on the known origins of cities which have developed within the historical period.

It is generally accepted that a prerequisite to permanent human settlement was the development of domesticated plants--one of the elements of the "neolithic revolution".[2] The emergence of an agricultural economy and increasing dependence on crops led, it is believed, to a gradual abandonment of the nomadic existence associated with dependence as a collectional economy. Neolithic settlements which began some 8,000 to 10,000 years ago,

however, comprised relatively small population groupings, villages rather than towns or cities, whose size was limited by a number of factors. The emergence of larger population aggregations--the town and the city--apparently depended on developments which did not appear until the metal ages; and indeed the rise of the large metropolis, the city of a million or more, is a modern phenomenon which had to await the industrial revolution.

Whereas domestication of plants and the appearance of an agricultural economy appears to have been a prerequisite to the emergence of the village, the rise of the town or city apparently required a number of additional technological and cultural developments, including: 1) greatly increased agricultural production; 2) adequate water supply; 3) effective communication and transportation; and 4) forms of political and social organization including forms of superordination and subordination and trade. The first three of these factors were essential elements in the development of an economy productive enough to enable relatively large population agglomerations to subsist without directly producing their own food supplies; and the fourth was necessary to assure the flow of supplies to the town and city populations through the imposition of force or the subtler dominance relationship effected by trade between the town and its hinterland.

The first population agglomerations which can be called towns probably do not by much antedate 5,000 B.C. Larger agglomerations meriting the designation cities probably did not appear until about 3,000 B.C. and prior to the Greco-Roman period these probably did not often exceed 100,000 inhabitants.

The Greek and Roman civilizations inherited a relatively substantial culture from Asia conducive to the existence of cities, technological and non-material. The Greeks and Romans further developed their cultural heritage and with the Romans produced the first really large cities of antiquity. Rome was probably the largest city in the history of man until 19th century London, with the possible exception of Constantinople which continued to thrive during the Dark Ages when European cities stagnated and decayed.

The European city which survived the Dark Ages as a fortress developed various functions. They tended each to have a special function, political or

economic. Medieval cities may be classified either as "towns with predominatly political and intellectual functions", or as having "a predominant economic function".[3] The multi-function city is seen as a recent phenomenon associated with modern industrialization technology, transport and administration. The multi-function city may be traced to the relationship between advancing technology and diversification of functions.

With the technological developments of the industrial revolution which greatly increased productivity, both agriculture and the non-agricultural, greatly improved transport and communication facilities, and new forms of social organization, including economic and political organization, the city entered a new era of development. The city of the industrial revolution could and did reach a relatively large size--over a million. It became a focal point of economic dominance in relation to an ever expanding hinterland which for some cities encompassed virtually the whole world. It became the habitat which modified the way of life of the major portion of the population of the industrialized countries; and profoundly altered also, the way of life of the rural population, that which remained resident outside of urban places.

Statistics on Growth

In the absence of censuses for most of the world throughout most of history, precise statistics on the growth of cities are not available. From such data as are available together with ingenious and analytical estimation procedures, however, Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz[4] have provided the most comprehensive facts about the growth of cities on a world wide and broad continental basis.

In the world as a whole, in 1800, it is estimated by Davis and Hertz that of a total population of 906 million persons, 27.2 million or 3 per cent lived in urban places of 5,000 or more inhabitants. Only 21.7 million or 2.4 per cent of the world's population and 15.6 million or 1.7 per cent of the world's population lived in cities of 20,000 and over, and 100,000 and over, respectively. (See Table 1.)

The proportion of the world's population resident in cities increased continuously and rapidly since 1800. By 1950, about 30 per cent of the population of the world lived in cities of 5,000 and over, about 21 per cent in cities of 20,000 and over, and about 13 per cent in places of 100,000 and over.

During the past century and a half the population of the world has grown at an unprecedentedly rapid rate increasing 2 1/2 times from about 900 to 2,400 million persons. But the growth of city population has been even more phenomenal as is indicated by the comparisons in Table 2.

Table 1. WORLD'S URBAN POPULATION COMPARED TO WORLD'S TOTAL POPULATION, 1800-1950

Year	World population (millions)	Urban places					
		5,000 and over		20,000 and over		100,000 and over	
		Population (millions)	Per cent of world population	Population (millions)	Per cent of world population	Population (millions)	Per cent of world population
1800	906	27.2	3.0	21.7	2.4	15.6	1.7
1850	1,171	74.9	6.4	50.4	4.3	27.5	2.3
1900	1,608	218.7	13.6	147.9	9.2	88.6	5.5
1950	2,400	716.7	29.8	502.2	20.9	313.7	13.1

Source: Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz, Patterns of World Urbanization, (forthcoming volume, Macmillan and Company).

While the world's total population increased by 29 per cent between 1800 and 1850, the population in cities of 5,000 or more increased by 175 per cent, that in cities of 20,000 and over by 132 per cent and that in cities of 100,000 or more by 76 per cent. Between 1850 and 1900 with the acceleration of industrialization in the Western countries urban populations increased by 192, 194, and 222 per cent, respectively, for the three size categories, while the total population increased by 37 per cent. During the first half of this century, while world population increased by 49 per cent, city populations continued to increase even more phenomenally with percentage increases of 228, 240 and 245 per cent for each of the size groupings.

In 1800, it is estimated that there were 750 cities of 5,000 or more persons in the world, 200 of 20,000 or more and 45 of 100,000 or more. By 1950, urban places of 5,000 or more inhabitants had increased to 27,600, those with 20,000 or more to 5,500; and those 100,000 and over to 875. Cities with 100,000 or more persons in 1950 included 133 with 500,000 or over, and 49 with over a million inhabitants. The world's urban places of various sizes in 1950, together with their populations and percentage of the world population are given in Table 3.

Over 700 million persons, nearly a third of the total world population today, live in cities of 5,000 or more; over 500 million, about one-fifth of the world's total population, and as many as inhabited the globe at the beginning of the modern era, in 1650, live in cities of 20,000 or more; over 300 million or about one-eighth of the total population live in cities of 100,000 or more; over 150 million, or 7 per cent of the total, live in cities of 500,000 or more; and over 100 million, or 4 per cent of the total, in cities of a million and over.

Table 2. COMPARISON OF WORLD'S URBAN POPULATION GROWTH RATES AND WORLD'S TOTAL POPULATION GROWTH RATES, 1800-1950

Period	Percentage increase in			
	Total world population	World population in cities		
		5,000 and over	20,000 and over	100,000 and over
1800-1850	29.2	175.4	132.3	76.3
1850-1900	37.3	192.0	193.5	222.2
1900-1950	49.3	227.7	239.6	254.1

Source: Calculated from statistics by Davis and Hertz (see Table 1).

Table 3. WORLD'S URBAN PLACES OF VARIOUS SIZE, 1950

Size of urban place	Number	Population (millions)	Per cent of total world population
5,000 and over	27,600	717	30
20,000 and over	5,500	502	21
100,000 and over	875	314	13
500,000 and over	133	158	7
1,000,000 and over	49	101	4

Source: From Davis and Hertz.

Davis and Hertz have reconstructed the growth of world urban population by continent since 1800. (Table 4) World population in cities of 100,000 and over increased from 15.6 million in 1800 to 314 million in 1950 or more than 20 times. The rate of increase throughout the century and a half was an accelerating one. Between 1800 and 1850, population in cities of 100,000 or more inhabitants increased by over 75 per cent; between 1850 and 1900, by 220 per cent; between 1900 and 1950, by 250 per cent. This world pattern of large city population growth, however, obscures diverse patterns among the continents reflecting the differential impact of industrialization.

In Europe, which led the world in industrialization, population in large cities grew well above the world average between 1800 and 1900 but below the world average in the first half of this century. Between 1800 and 1850, large city population in Europe increased by about 150 per cent, and between 1850 and 1900, by about 250 per cent. Between 1900 and 1950, however, large city population increase in Europe declined to 97 per cent.

Since the population growth in the Americas represents largely an expansion of European population, the combination of Europe and the Americas is not inappropriate for contrast with developments in Asia. The pattern of growth of European and American large city population, combined in relation to growth of world large city population, remains the same. The large city populations of Europe and America combined grew more rapidly than that of the world between 1800 and 1900 and more slowly since 1900.

Table 4. SHARE OF WORLD'S LARGE CITY (100,000 AND OVER) POPULATION IN MAJOR CONTINENTAL REGIONS

Region	1800 Population (millions)	1800 Per cent	1850 Population (millions)	1850 Per cent	1900 Population (millions)	1900 Per cent	1950 Population (millions)	1950 Per cent
World	15.6	100.0	27.5	100.0	88.6	100.0	313.7	100.0
Asia	9.8	62.8	12.2	44.5	19.4	21.9	105.6	33.7
Europe a/	4.8	30.8	12.1	43.9	42.1	47.5	83.1	26.5
USSR	0.57	3.7	1.1	4.1	5.9	6.7	35.1	11.2
Africa	0.30	1.9	0.25	0.9	1.4	1.5	10.2	3.2
America	0.13	0.8	1.8	6.6	18.6	21.0	74.6	23.8
Oceania	--	--	--	--	1.3	1.4	5.1	1.6

a/ All of USSR included.

In Asia, large city population growth was well below the world average growth, as well as the European and American growth, between 1800 and 1900; but greatly above the world average growth and combined European and American growth since 1900. In fact, the increase of large city population growth in Asia since 1900 exceeded that in Europe and the Americas both in absolute number and percentage increase by far.

Between 1800 and 1850, the large city population of Asia increased by about 25 per cent in contrast with an increase of 184 per cent in Europe and America combined. Between 1850 and 1900, Asian large city population increased by about 60 per cent as contrasted with an increase of over 330 per cent in Europe and America. In the first half of this century, however, the large city population of Asia has grown by almost 450 per cent as compared with only 160 per cent in Europe and America.

Thus, although the rate of growth of large city populations in the world as a whole has not slackened since 1800, that of the most industrialized part of the world, Europe and America, har slowed up; while the growth of large city populations in Asia, which was well below European and American levels during

the early phases of industrialization, has been proceeding more rapidly during the first half of this century. In consequence, there is an inflection point in 1900 in the distribution of the world's large city population by continent. In 1800, Asia had almost two-thirds (63 per cent) of the world's large city population; whereas Europe and America had most of the remainder. By 1900, Asia had less than a fourth (22 per cent) of the total; whereas Europe and America had over two-thirds (69 per cent). By 1950, however, with the slow-up in growth of city population in the West and relative acceleration in growth in the East, Asia had more than one-third of the world's large city population; whereas Europe's and America's share had declined to about a half.

It is clear from the data which have been presented that cities, including large cities, are to be found in Asia as well as in the Western world. However, Asia, with 53 per cent of the world's population, has 58 per cent of the world's population resident in places having less than 20,000 persons, but only 34 per cent of the world's population resident in cities with 20,000 or more persons (also in cities with 100,000 or more persons). The disparity in these proportions points to the difference between the mere presence of cities and "urbanization". Davis and Golden emphasizes this distinction, reserving the term "urbanization" to refer to the proportion of the total population which is resident in cities.[5/] It is the degree of urbanization of a nation rather than whether it has cities or not that, on the one hand, seems related to the degree of industrialization or economic development; and, on the other hand, that has significant implications for changes in culture, the way of life and many of the problems associated with the city.

The distribution of world urbanization by continent is not the same as Davis emphasizes, as that of cities or urban inhabitants. In the world as a whole 21 per cent of the population reside in cities of 20,000 or more inhabitants. In Asia, only 13 per cent of the population resided in large cities; only Africa with 9 per cent was less urbanized by this criterion. Central America and the Caribbean area had 21 per cent of its population resident in large cities; South America 26 per cent; USSR 31 per cent; the remainder of Europe 35 per cent; North America (Canada and USA) 42 per cent; and Oceania 47 per cent.

The extent to which an area is urbanized is highly correlated with its degree of industrialization--or inversely with the extent to which it is dependent on agriculture.

The inverse relationship between the degree of agriculturism and urbanization has been documented by Davis and Golden. Countries of the world grouped by per cent of males gainfully occupied in agriculture show a consistent pattern of decreasing urbanization with increasing dependence on agriculture. (Table 5) By continent, the pattern remains essentially the same. Asia, with 70 per cent of economically active males engaged in agriculture, had only 8 per cent of its population in cities of 100,000 or more inhabitants. Africa, the only continent less urbanized than Asia, had a larger proportion of males in agriculture, 78 per cent. On the other hand, North America, with only 17 per cent of her males in agriculture had, except for Oceania, the highest degree of urbanization. Oceania, with a relatively small population, is the only continental area which breaks the pattern in the relationship between agriculture and urbanization which has been described.

If the percentage of economically active males in agriculture is taken as an index of economic development, then the less developed areas of the world, those with 50 per cent or more of their males in agriculture, have more people living in cities of 100,000 or more (160 million) than the more developed countries (155 million). But the less developed areas are less urbanized than the more developed countries.6/

Another set of data which help to explain the presence of urbanization as distinguished from cities, is to be found in the efficiency of agriculture--of which agricultural density is an index. Curiously enough although, as Davis and Golden have shown, there is no correlation between urbanization and density of national populations,7/ there is an inverse relationship between urbanization and agricultural density as measured by males in agriculture per square mile of agricultural land. Thus, countries with high agricultural density, thus defined, have the smallest proportion of urban population. In countries which averaged 136 agricultural males per square mile of agricultural land, the percentage of the population resident in cities of 100,000 or more per acre

ranged below 10 per cent. In contrast, in countries which averaged only 13 males in agriculture per square mile of agricultural land, the proportion of population in large cities ranged above 30 per cent. (See Table 6.)

The inverse relationship between agricultural density and urbanization reflects, of course, the efficiency of agriculture as a factor in urbanization. Low agricultural density, on this broad continental basis, is an index of advanced agricultural technology and relatively high agricultural productivity. To achieve high urbanization indexes, a nation must, apparently as a prerequisite, achieve an agricultural productivity adequate to support large urban populations.

It is in the positive relationship between urbanization and industrialization on the one hand; and the inverse relationship between urbanization and agricultural density on the other, that Davis and Golden account for the historical occurence of urbanization and discusses the prospects for the future. In 1800, he points out, "the population in large cities was distributed over the earth in much the same fashion as the general population. With the rise and spread of industrialism in the nineteenth century, the European peoples--rapidly and markedly--increased their degree of urbanization".[8/]

Table 5. DEGREE OF URBANIZATION IN WORLD'S COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES CLASSIFIED BY DEGREE OF AGRICULTURALISM

Per cent of gainfully occupied males in agriculture	Number of countries	Per cent of population in cities 100,000 and over
0-19	11	32.3
20-29	11	23.6
30-39	7	23.2
40-49	7	21.9
50-59	16	17.7
60-69	17	8.9
70 +	86	6.3

Source: Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz Golden, "Urbanization and the Development of Pre-Industrial Areas", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Volume III, No. 1, October 1954, p. 8.

Table 6. AGRICULTURAL DENSITY ACCORDING TO DEGREE OR URBANISM

Per cent of population in cities 100,000 and over	Agricultural males per square mile of agricultural land
0- 9.9	136
10-19.9	72
20-29.9	67
30 +	13

Source: Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz Golden, "Urbanization and the Development of Pre-Industrial Areas", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Volume III, No. 1, October, 1954, p.10.

Davis and Golden interpret the greater urbanization of the Western World as compared with Asia as "a temporary phenomenon".[9] Not only have their estimates and analyses indicated that the rate of urbanization in Europe and America slackened in recent decades, while that of Asia has increased, but, also, the data indicated that the more recently industrialized countries, including Japan, have tended to urbanize more rapidly than did the countries which first experienced industrialization. It is possible, conclude Davis and Golden, that "the next fifty or one hundred years may find the city population once again distributed roughly in proportion to the world's total population. If so, it will mark the end of a gigantic cycle--the urbanization of the world".[10]

The status of urbanization in industrial countries in the ECAFE area around 1950, the growth of cities and urbanization in these countries, the distribution of the population by size of place, and characteristics of the urban population are shown, as far as data are available, in the paper prepared for the Seminar "Demographic Aspects of Urbanization in the ECAFE Region". (Prepared by Population Branch, Bureau of Social Affairs.) It should also be noted that the United Nations has in two recent editions of the Demographic Yearbook, presented what statistics it has been able to obtain on cities and

urbanization in the world. In the Demographic Yearbook 1952, data are presented on "urban-rural" populations from 1900 to 1951. In the 1955 Demographic Yearbook, three tables are given: one showing the population of the capital city and cities of 100,000 or more (Table 6 in the Yearbook); one on urban-rural population by sex (Table 7 in the Yearbook); and one on population by size of locality and sex (Table 8 in the Yearbook).

DEFINITION OF TERMS

"Urban-rural" statistics are difficult to handle for purposes of international comparability because the concept and definition of "urban" varies greatly by country as is shown in the United Nations Yearbook.

The delineation of areas as urban or rural, as is indicated by the United Nations, is often tied in with administrative, political, historical or cultural considerations. Definitions of urban fall into three major types.

"1) classification of minor civil divisions on a chosen criterion which may include: a) type of local governments, b) number of inhabitants, c) proportion of population engaged in agriculture;

2) classification of administrative centers of minor rural divisions as urban and the remainder of the division as rural; and

3) classification of certain size localities (agglomerations) as urban, irrespective of administrative boundaries".[11]

In the United States, for example, the population for urban places is presented in three ways--for the political unit, the city; for the "urbanized area", the city plus contiguous built up area meeting certain density and other criteria; and for the "standard metropolitan area"--the central city, together with the county in which it is located and contiguous county units meeting certain criteria as being part of the "metropolitan" area.[12] The definition of "urban" in the 1950 census in the United States was changed from that of preceeding censuses to include, not only incorporated places of 2,500 or more inhabitants but, also, unincorporated places of this size whose boundaries were delineated by the census together with the population of "urbanized areas", outside as well as inside the central city or cities.

Because of the complex nature of the problem, the United Nations Population Commission has recommended that in addition to "urban-rural" statistics as defined by individual countries, data be presented by size of locality or identifiable agglomeration. This would permit improved comparability even though it left the cutting point for "urban" and "rural", respectively, an arbitrary matter.

The "urban-rural" classification, however, despite its variability by country, still serves a useful purpose. The United Nations, after describing the problems of international comparability in urban-rural statistics, says:

"Despite their shortcomings, however, statistics of population by urban and rural are useful for comparing on a broad scale degree of urbanization between countries or territories. No matter how they are defined, "urban" is likely to include a heavy concentration of clearly urban population, while "rural" will be heavily weighted toward village or clearly rural areas. Thus, the differences between urban and rural characteristics of the population, though not precisely measured, will tend to be reflected in the statistics".[13]

Apart from the variations in the definition of the basic terms "urban" and "rural" the literature varies considerably also in the use of such terms as "urbanism" and "urbanization". "Urbanism" is used by Wirth to refer to the "way of life" and by Queen and Carpenter to identify place of residence.[14] The latter uses the term "urbanization" to refer to the distinctive way of life associated with the city--the opposite of Wirth's usage. Davis, as we have seen, uses "urbanization" to refer to the proportion of a population resident in cities. Other authors have given still different meanings to these terms. Moreover, differences exist in the meanings assigned to related terms such as "community", "society" and "folk culture", some aspects of which are discussed below.[15]

Because of the differences in usage of these terms by authors within nations and between nations, it is important, in dealing with materials relating to the city, to be sure that the exact connotation of each individual author is clear; and that confusion be avoided arising from semantic rather than substantive differences.

URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The materials which have been presented above may be summarized in two propositions in respect of the relation between economic development and urbanization.

First, it is clear that cities are possible only after the economic and social organization of a nation have developed to a point where agricultural productivity, division of labor, transport and political and social structure make possible population agglomerations which can subsist without raising their own supplies of foods and fibers. Second, it is also clear that the emergence of cities does not necessarily result in a high degree of urbanization. Urbanization, defined as the proportion of the population resident in cities, is a relatively recent development associated with the industrial revolution.

Industrialization, dependent on the use of non-human energy and machine technology and bringing with these material changes far reaching non-material cultural changes, became a dominant element of national economies only during the 19th century. It is only since 1800 that the populations of some countries have become highly urbanized. Moreover, it is only with the developments accompanying industrialization that the city with a million or more inhabitants has emerged as a form of human habitation and social organization.

The increased urbanization of populations, as we have seen, proceeded rapidly during the nineteenth century in the European and American countries which were in the vanguard of industrialization. Since 1900, however, the pace of urbanization in the Western countries has slowed up, whereas that of some countries in Asia has accelerated. Since increased urbanization has accompanied industrial development and has been described both as an antecedent and consequent of economic development, let us examine in greater detail the relationships between industrial development and urbanization in the West as a basis for assaying the present situation in Asia and anticipating some aspects of the future.

Although there are no highly developed economies of the world in which both large cities and a high degree of urbanization are not present, the precise inter-relationships between cities, the degree of urbanization and economic development are not really known. Cities have often been studied by students of many disciplines including geographers, sociologists, demographers, human ecologists, political scientists, engineers and architects and city planners, but rarely by economists.

Economists have paid some attention to "location theory" but as Lampard indicates, "they rarely went on to link their discussion of spatial factors to the more complex phenomenon of economic growth".[16] He points out that "... no branch of economics yet studies the city in a comprehensive way"; and that to his knowledge "no systematic study has ever been made of the role of cities in recent economic development". In consequence, it must be emphasized that what can be said about the role of cities and urbanization in economic development is based largely on conclusions of a speculative character which appear to be plausible in the light of what is known. Moreover, the facts which are available and such interpretations of them as have been assayed, are drawn, it must be emphasized, largely from the experience of the West.

In dealing with the relationships of the city and urbanization to economic development in Asia, therefore, one must be exceedingly cautious neither to confuse tentative and speculative generalizations for conclusions well grounded in empirical research; nor to assume that that which is known about the experience of the West is necessarily applicable to the situation in Asia. With this emphasis on limitations, let us proceed to a brief summary of what is known about urbanization and economic development.

Economic Stages and Settlement

In a broad way, Gras has sketched the relationships between economic development and settlement or habitation patterns in his account of economic history.[17] Using historical materials on ways of making a living and technology, on the one hand, and forms of human settlement or community, on the other, Gras has related the two in a classification which intertwines both. He describes

the emergence of Western Civilization in five stages or periods as follows: 1) the collectional economy, 2) the cultural nomadic economy, 3) the settled village economy, 4) the town economy, and 5) the metropolitan economy.

In the Gras perspective, the settled village economy, the first permanent form of human settlement, was dependent on the domestication of plants and animals and on the development of agriculture as a dominant way of making a living, as distinguished from the preceding stages of hunting and fishing, and nomadic existence. The town economy was dependent on the development of increased agricultural productivity, the crafts, transport and trade. The metropolitan economy is that in which the large city serves as a nucleus for a hinterland together with which it represents a form of interdependent economic organization. It emerges with the complex of technological and organizational changes associated with industrialization and characterizes modern social and economic organization. Gras points out that these various states of economic development and forms of human settlement or community, can and do, coexist.

Industrial and Urbanism Stages

Lampard, in his treatment of urban-industrial growth, follows the classification, if not the language of Geddes. Concentrating on later urban and industrial development, he considers urban-industrial history in three phases: 1) the pre-industrial phase, 2) the industrial phase, 3) the metropolitan phase.[18] The pre-industrial phase is seen as coming to a close in much of Europe and America towards the end of the 18th century. The industrial phase encompasses largely the 19th century. The metropolitan phase begins roughly with the 20th century. Lampard places the economically advanced areas in the metropolitan phase; and the remainder of the world in either the industrial or pre-industrial phases.[19] He recognizes, of course, great diversity within each phase.

The pre-industrial city. Lampard summarizes the literature on urbanism in pre-industrial, largely mediaeval and early modern Europe, as follows: "Urban

centers were court cities, cathedral cities, fortress cities, markets, ports, country towns, and mere villages. Many, of course, were composites of several types".

He stresses the limitations of pre-industrial European cities as "limited (dominated) by the needs and capacities of a rural hinterland and a highly stratified society". Lampard's description of the pre-industrial medieval European urban setting is worth reproducing as descriptive in large measure of many of the cities in Asia today.

"Inhabitants of town and country alike were imprisoned within their physical and mental horizons. To escape meant to transcend rather than transform the environment and, as a consequence, men lacked much practical mastery over nature. Manufactures were largely handicrafts, as much rural as urban, carried on in close relation to husbandry. Animals were often stunted from lack of proper feed and care; crop surpluses, important near towns, were small and sometimes non-existent. Mining was likewise rural and rudimentary, confined by technique to exposed and often inaccessible places. Metallurgy remained a skilled, but highly esoteric, art. Transport was uncertain and, for the most part, limited by cost and capacity to freights of small bulk and high value. Ships moved as the wind freshened; packs were lifted and wheels turned but only as the tensed muscles of men or animals could take the load. Though refined, the channels of communication and commerce were narrow, discontinuous, and rarely strained. The city was becoming a locus for achievement; town and country people led increasingly different lives, but both dwelt in a pre-industrial world".[20]

The pre-industrial European world on the eve of the development of industry is described as "essentially a loose-knit system of food economies centering on a few relatively large mercantile--administrative capitals, with a growing inter-regional commerce but no marked territorial division of labor". This description is also an apt characterization of the situation in a number of the countries in Asia.[21]

The industrial-urban center. The acceleration in the development of agriculture and industrial technology during the 18th century was "accompanied by a singular concentration of productive functions in the semi-rural towns and villages of the day". Moreover, the towns "were becoming a major outlet for capital accumulated in commercialized agricultural production".[22] The movement of population towards sources of power--water and coal--was greatly accelerated by the appearance of the steam engine. The steam engine and the factory system which it produced provided the centripetal force giving rise to the industrial city. Actual location included, of course, attention to satisfactory communication, transport and access to markets. The cumulative character and piling up process of both factories and labor in the industrial centers is well documented in the history of the English industrial cities such as Manchester and Birmingham.[23] By the first part of the 19th century, England already had a hierarchy of industrial-commercial-transport centers. Moreover, regional specialization had progressed markedly so that the cotton, wool and iron towns had become sharply differentiated, each proceeding with its own cycle of technical and organizational development.

Associated with the growth of the industrial urban center was the development of a labor force diversified in skill and relatively stable as a labor supply for expanding industry.

The pattern of development of the industrial urban center in England was paralleled during the first half of the 19th century in France, the Low Countries and Northeastern United States. Both France and the United States present special situations, however, which may have important implications for the countries in Asia.

In France, the industrial economy was greatly concentrated in Paris which overshadowed all other urban development. Only a few specialized cities--coal, textile and port--emerged as urban centers between gigantic Paris and smaller industrial towns. Two types of towns were apparent during the early period of industrialization in France. One were the older "administrative-commercial" centers whose functions centered largely on serving a rural hinterland. The second, were more like the English industrial towns but with limited potentialities for growth because of "natural isolation" or failure to enter into communication with the rest of the larger economy.

The growth of industrial centers in the United States may have a special interest to the countries of Asia because their development at the beginning was influenced by their colonial character. The colonial economy of the early American cities was a dependent economy in the sense that it "depended on the European hinterland for population, capital, customs and much of its enterprise".[24] The expansion of American cities after independence was at first primarily a growth due to increased trade with and services to the interior of the United States as economic ties with England were [illegible] spinning mills and manufacturers in New England paved the way for the factory system and the industrial revolution in the United States. Capital shortages, transport difficulties and technical problems retarded urban growth in the early 19th century but with the development of the railroad after 1840, cities mushroomed and the rate of urbanization greatly accelerated. The remarkable growth of United States cities reflected more than industrialization above, however. The growth of cities in the United States was also in large measure due to the development and exploitation of the resources of the underdeveloped and largely uninhabited continent. By the last quarter of the 19th century, mid-western industrial urban centers had appeared on the American scene to dominate great rural hinterlands. Chicago, for example, with a population of less than 5,000 in 1840, surpassed the one million mark by 1890.

The major ingredients of the rapid development of industrial urban centers in Europe and the United States included the emergence of new fuels, materials and mechanical aids, a closer integration of productive and managerial processes, and improvements in transport and communication.

The metropolitan city. The technological base for the third phase of urbanism, the metropolitan phase, is in general found in the great increase in the application of science to industry, in the widespread utilization of electric power and in the advent of the automobile. The third phase does not represent a sharp break with the second, but rather a "widening and deepening of technical influences in every aspect of our existence".[25]

The utilization of electricity as a source of power and for communication introduced to industrial urban patterns of growth and development centrifugal forces in addition to the centripetal forces previously described.

The tendency for the urban agglomeration to cling to the industrial base under steam and belt and pulley power had, by the beginning of the 20th century, produced great congestion in urban areas and increasing costs of frictions arising from the congestion. A number of factors were building up to buck the centripetal pressures such as rising city taxes, increased land values, traffic and transport problems, decayed and obsolescent inner zones, both industrial and residential. These and other forces making for decentralization accelerated the centrifugal movement made possible by electric power, rapid transit, the automobile and the telephone. In the last decade of the 19th century and first two decades of the 20th, satellite and suburban areas were developing rapidly.

The metropolis of today, in the countries with greatest economic development, is a center or nucleus for a metropolitan area which has become a basic economic and social unit in the national and world economy. With many of the characteristics described by Gras a generation ago and unity and interdependence documented by McKenzie and Bogue more recently, the metropolitan community at once represents a gigantic population agglomeration which combines centralization with decentralization, and specialization and differentiation of function with integration and interdependence relationships.[26]

Systems of cities. The development of the metropolitan community, as a basic unit of economic and social organization in industrial countries, has accompanied continued industrial expansion and economic development. The metropolitan community, consisting of the metropolis together with its hinterland over which it exerts economic dominance but in a matrix of interdependent economic relations, may be thought of as both an effect and a cause of rapid and great economic development.

Moreover, the industrial metropolitan economy produces, not only individual cities and metropolitan areas, but "systems" of such cities and areas. A number of writers have been struck with the fact that cities in the more developed economies tend to constitute a "system" which in some respects can be described mathematically and which suggest that systematic and presumably ascertainable forces account for the development of cities and their interrelationships.[27]

The most widely known of these descriptions of cities as a "system" is that known as the "rank-size" rule.[28] This rule is the generalization of the observed fact that in many countries, especially the more economically developed ones, cities follow a definite pattern in size and rank relationship. That is, the rank of any city in the system, by order of size, can be obtained by dividing the population of the given city into the population of the largest city in the system, that with rank 1. For example, in the United States, the rank of the Pittsburgh "urbanized area", thus obtained, would be 8 because 12,223,000--the population of the "urbanized area" of New York-North Eastern, New Jersey, divided by that of Pittsburgh, 1,526,000, is 8. This actually is the rank by size of the Pittsburgh area. In fact, in the United States, the rank-size rule tends to hold remarkably closely, not only at the present time, but over time throughout the history of the country.[29]

The system of cities described by the rank-size rule in economically advanced countries is undoubtedly a part of the unique historical developments in pre-industrial countries. It undoubtedly reflects the play of market forces in essentially free enterprise economies.

More complex systems have also been described. The most general and comprehensive is that of Lösch.[30] Christaller has also presented a description of a system of cities shown by Lösch to be a special case of his more general treatment.[31] In the present state of knowledge, it is probably not possible to create a mathematical model which can fully explain systems of cities in the more developed economies. But the efforts to find such explanations, on the one hand, indicate that we have still much to learn about the interrelations between economic development, city growth and urbanization; on the other, suggest that the pattern of urbanization in the economically advanced countries is an offshoot of a market economy.

Urbanization and Economic Development--Summary

There is no adequate body of theory nor are there adequate empirical studies clarifying the relationship between urbanization and economic development in general, or industrialization in particular. Such efforts, as are to be found in literature to link the growth of cities to economic development or industrialization, vary from explanations of the city as "passive incidents

in the growth and refinement of transportation systems",[32] to abnormal or evil deviations from a more "natural" rural type of order. Urban geographers, human ecologists and sociologists have done much to describe the function of the city in the economic and social order. But the descriptions are far from complete and are culture bound, in the sense of being restricted largely to observation of European and American cities whose development was largely the function of a market economy.

Lampard, in his summarization of "the economics of urban growth", stresses specialization and differentiation of economic functions as "an essential link between the technical and spatial conditions of economic progress".[33] The urban industrial society provides both the opportunity and need for specialization through which "greater economy of time, effort, and resources--the sources of higher productivity and material advance" are achieved. The urban setting on the one hand permits and accelerates specialization and on the other is its product. "In pre-industrial societies, where factors are relatively unspecialized, economic functions and organizations tend to be uniform, simple and scattered--very much according to circumstances of geography. ... Specialization revolutionizes the spatial pattern of economic activity. ..." Specialization produces "ecological inter-dependence" which is described as "essentially a centripetal force". "To reduce operational imperfections and space frictions (which, from an economic standpoint, represent costs), inter-dependent specialisms tend to draw together and 'link' in more integrated local sequences. ... The older balance between agricultural and industrial, rural and urban, populations is disturbed and regions of specialized industrial revolution are joint products of a single cultural strand--specialization".

An exceedingly useful synthesis of what is known about the emergence of the city in relation to economic development, is pithily summarized in the following two sentences. "From a socio-ecological standpoint, city growth is simply the concentration of differentiated but functionally integrated specialisms in rational locales. The modern city is a mode of social organization which furthers efficiency in economic activity".[34] Haig, who "showed urban growth to be part of a great rationalizing process in the industrial society", and

Marshall, who described both the internal economies of scale (ultimately derived from managerial capacity and the volume of business)" and "external" economies (flowing from the "industrial atmosphere" of the city)[35] are important parts of the literature in location analysis and land economics which help to document this observation.

A final point in respect to the economics of urban growth is that dealing with the growth of "tertiary" activities as an index of economic progress. This relationship and its tie to the city is seen in the following passage.

"If the growth of tertiary employment may be regarded as symptomatic of progress, it is significant that it also points in the direction of the city. Primary activities are best located where resources abound; near fertile farm land, in great forests, or on rich ocean banks. Secondary production is most advantageous in or about industrial centers, or at points variously distant--depending on frictions of bulk or perishability--from suppliers of materials and consumers of products. The area of tertiary activities, however, is even more confined in that its product is closely tied to a consuming population which is overwhelmingly urban or suburban. As Colin Clark has suggested, the city is the only feasible locus for the mass of specialized servicing".[36]

As a word of caution, however, it should be noted that the presence of tertiary activities in Asian cities do not necessarily represent high economic development. On the contrary, many of the tertiary activities in Asian cities are forms of under-employment and symptomatic of a low level of living, rather than indexes of high economic development.[37]

So much for the consideration of urbanization in relation to economic development. The growth of cities and increasing urbanization have also had implications for social change and social problems. Let us turn next to a consideration of urbanization in relation to cultural change and social problems.

URBANIZATION IN RELATION TO SOCIAL CHANGE AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Urbanization, as has been indicated, was in a fundamental sense a technological and ecological phenomenon organized around rapidly changing and increasingly specialized ways of making a living and accelerated by the centripetal force of the steam engine. Industrialization and urbanization carried with it, not only a changed physical environment and radically altered forms of economic organization but, also, inevitably and irresistibly, profound influences on social and political organization and on man's conduct and his thought.

The basic influence of a city in introducing a new way of life as well as a new form of habitation and economic structure, has long been recognized by both lay and technical observers. The literature of antiquity refers with some frequency to the disorganizing effects of city life, and 19th and 20th century social scientists and writers have elaborated on the differences between urban and rural living.[38] These elaborations have usually taken the form of establishing a dichotomy or continuum in respect to "community" or "society," the "folk" or the "urban," and the "urban" or the "rural."

These dichotomizations and continua have variously appeared in the literature as "ideal-types" or conceptual tools for research, on the one hand; and, on the other hand, sometimes as generalizations presumably based on empirical research. While these concepts have undoubted proven utility as tools of research and analysis, there is a danger that they may be accepted as premature generalizations without the benefit of adequate empiricism--especially if the complex of characteristics associated with the polarities represented, based largely on observation of the Western world, are assumed to be applicable with equal force to Asia.

Community and Society

A basic link between the city as an economic structure and as a social order is given by the conceptualization of the difference between "community" and "society" as formalized by Tönnies.[39] Economic cohesion and integration have been achieved in the urban order of the Western world largely through the process of competition. But the competitive process serves, not only to effect an equilibrium in the market place in the narrow classical economic sense, but, also

to organize the "community"--the total spatial and temporary pattern of relationships which serves as a substructure for "society"--our heritage of mores, folkways, institutions and patterns of conduct and of thought. In many respects, the key to an understanding of the basic difference between modern urban and pre-industrial rural life is to be found in the extent to which the process of competition is a force in the pattern of existence--in the extent to which "community" or "society," as these concepts are used by the sociologist, is more or less descriptive of the structure and process that serve as binding forces in an aggregation of human beings.

"Community" is a grouping of individuals that arises in a given area through the interdependence created by the mechanisms of competition. "Society" is an organization of persons which is achieved through communication, through the emergence of consensus and a common culture. The process of competition is impersonal, unconscious utilitarian and involves no social contact. The process of communication is a process of social interaction; it is personal, conscious, necessitates social contact and invokes sympathy, reciprocity, appreciation and sentiment. The pre-industrial rural aggregation was in larger measure a "society" than a "community." The city is in large measure a "community" than a "society." An understanding of the differences between "community" and "society" and its implications is an important key to an understanding of urbanism both as effect and a cause of social change.

Urbanism as a Way of Life

The most penetrating and insightful attempt to relate the basic characteristics of the urban environment to changes in human behavior and the nature of the social order is to be found in Wirth's classic statement of "Urbanism as a Way of Life."[40/] Abstracting and emphasizing size, density and heterogeneity as three fundamental characteristics of the urban setting, Wirth in his avowedly preliminary effort to set forth a theory of urbanism, attempts systematically to show how these characteristics have influenced social contact, personal development and the nature of human nature itself.

In respect of the first of these characteristics of the urban setting, the sheer size of the population agglomeration, Wirth, following Simmel and others, points to the "atomization" of social relations which is produced, of the consequent "secondary" contacts, segmental roles and schizoid type of personality

development. It is as a function of the size of the population agglomeration itself that inter-personal relations become more superficial, anonymous, utilitarian and rational, losing their pre-urban attributes of spontaneity, sentiment, warmth and personal qualities. It may be said that as a result of sheer size alon , unity and cohesion in a city flow primarily from the inter-dependence of economic specialization and division of labor as contrasted with the consensus of the pre-urban social order.

The density of urban populations, as distinguished from sheer size, both flows from and generates differentiation and specialization. Associated with and flowing from density are a number of changes from pre-urban existence which, in addition to representing significant changes in the way of life, generate additional changes. These include such phenomena as the separation of place of work from place of residence; the glaring contrasts of poverty and riches and ignorance and intelligence, the ecological patterning of the city into "natural" areas and segregated population groupings. Associated with and flowing from these phenomena are the increased secularization of life, intense competition, aggrandizement and mutual exploitation. Also involved are personal frictions, irritations and frustrations.

In the third of these characteristics of the urban environment, namely heterogeneity, Wirth sees the source of the breaking of caste lines and previous forms of social stratification and new and complicating forms of class structure. With heterogeneity of peoples, the individual grows more instable and insecure, on the one hand; and rational, sophisticated and cosmopolitan, on the other. The person tends to become further atomized, no single group has his single undivided allegiance, membership in groups is subject to rapid turnover and personality has segments corresponding to and reflecting group memberships. Mobility, physical and social, is greater; the person is not rooted to a place as a renter in the same sense in which he previously was, as an owner. Behavior is depersonalized. Behavior becomes mass behavior, fluid and unpredictable, and a function largely of mass media of communication. It is in the heterogeneity of cultures and peoples that many social scientists have traced the source of social change, of innovation that is associated with urban civilization.

The urban setting, in effect, has modified the nature of human nature. Human nature, as conceived of by the sociologist, is the product of the "original" and "acquired" natures of man. The original nature of man is transmitted through hereditary changes, gradually and slowly in accordance with the principles of genetics and biological evolution. The acquired nature of man is a function of social change and is, therefore, subject to comparatively rapid and drastic modification. In the urban environment, the acquired nature of man has been changed by changes in the mechanism and process of social interaction as well as by changes in culture and social heritage. In the urban setting, the matrix of social interaction, the framework of human relations, has been greatly altered from its pre-urban counterpart.

One of the most important differences between the urban and rural environment, as it affects the conduct of the person, is to be found in the extent to which he is faced with the necessity of exercising choice, of substituting rational for traditional ways of doing things. In the pre-urban setting, there is generally a prescribed way of dealing with most situations, certainly, the most important recurrent situations in life. In the city, there are almost always alternatives--and the person is forced to make a choice. This enforced rationalism frequently produces bad choices, strains and adverse reactions. But it has also opened up new vistas for self expression, and for the exercise of man's ingenuity; and new opportunities for shaping both man's environment and his destiny. It is not merely a coincidence that the great centers of learning, invention, innovation, art and culture have historically been in urban areas.

In the new urban matrix of social interaction, a new human nature has been bred which is still in process of social evolution. The city environment is modifying the "acquired nature" of man and placing greater pressure on the exercise of that faculty which distinguishes man from the rest of the animal kingdom--his reason. The "city mentality" described by Park, [41] characterized by its sophistication, objectivity, utilitarianism and rationalism, is, on the one hand, a product of the urban environment, and, on the other, a major force producing and influencing changes in our social heritage, in our economic, social and political institutions, and in the urban environment itself.

The Family

As a microcosm of the social whole the family is a convenient unit through which to trace many of the influences of urbanization on behavior and on social institutions. The family has traditionally been recognized as the primary social unit and the keystone of social organization. It served in Western as well as in Asian cultures as a basic and largely self sufficient economic unit; it had primary responsibility for the socialization and education of the young; it was the focal point for religious training and practices; it provided for the security and protection of its members; and it was a center for their recreational and affectional life.

Even this most solidly rooted of social institutions, however, has been subject to basic changes under the impact of urbanization. The urban family, in the more economically developed nations, is not what it used to be. Compared to the pre-urban family, the city family is smaller, it is more often childless, it is much more mobile, it is no longer a producing economic unit, it is more frequently broken by separation and divorce and has lost to, or shares many of its various historic functions with, new specialized urban institutions. 42/

The minute division of labor which underlies urban existence has tended to deprive the family of its productive economic function and has also directly introduced elements of family disunity by leading working members of the family into different competing and sometimes conflicting social orbits, represented by specialized occupational and industrial affiliations. Many of the specific economic functions formerly centered in the family are in the city, performed outside the home, as is indicated by the mention of such places as the clothing store, the laundry, the restaurant, the janitor, etc.

The family shares the function of socializing and educating the young with the school, the library, the radio, the press, the T.V. and the cinema. The function of the family as a center for religious training and practices has been greatly attenuated. New dangers and new forms of insecurity introduced by urban life have cut into the protective functions of the family. For example, the family alone has proved incapable of dealing with such new hazards as unemployment, traffic accidents, crime and old age. New institutions have emerged to supplement the protection which the family can give--the police department, health and welfare services, insurance, social security, labor unions and the like.

Recreational functions of the family have been supplanted or shared with the golf course, public parks, swimming pools, concerts and the motion picture. Even the affectional function of the family is under strain in the city as is indicated by the urban divorce and separation rates.

The relationship of husband and wife, parents to children, siblings to one another, and of the "small" to the "large" family have also been redefined in the urban setting. Inter-personal relations of family members have also tended to become segmental contacts competing with a whole host of outside familial relationships.

It is against the background of the basic changes provided by the urban setting that social disorganization and social problems can be understood.

Social Disorganization

Social disorganization is a stage in process of social change. It is an intermediate stage between social organization and social reorganization. The changed physical and economic structure produced by industrialization and urbanization has through the mechanisms and processes indicated above produced personal and cultural changes. The social disorganization manifest in the urban community may be viewed as products of cultural friction, resulting from the differential rates of change among the components of the traditional social heritage and the basic changes in the nature of interpersonal relations in the urban environment.

The person is viewed by the sociologist as the subjective aspect of culture and personal disorganization as the subjective aspect of social disorganization. Thus, the juvenile delinquent and the criminal are subjective manifestations of the breakdown of inherited social controls. They are symptoms of the deteriorating influence in the urban environment of such social institutions as the family and the church, of the waning grip of the mores, of the inadequacy, as yet, of the emergent new controls represented by such substitute institutions as the school, the court, the prison and the reformatory. The neurotic, the victim of the nervous breakdown, the insane, the alcoholic, and the suicide reflect the strains, pressures, and crises imposed on the person by cultural maladjustments creating social situations with which the person cannot cope. Immorality, prostitution and other forms of vice, in large measure, flow from the basic maladjustment between the insistent biological and emotional urges of mankind,

and a social heritage and sex mores which do not provide adequate acceptable channels of conduct. The pauper, sweated labor, the unemployed, the aged dependent, the striker and the revolutionist are some of the by products of rapid change and attendant frictions in our economic organization and in its impact on other aspects of total social organization. The corrupt political boss mirrors the disorganization of political institutions caught in the vortex of rapid social change. 43/

This is not to say that these and other forms of personal and social disorganization did not make their appearance before the industrial revolution and the emergence of the city as a dominant form of economic and social organization. The history of Western Civilization is replete with other instances of social and economic change which also produced varying degrees of cultural maladjustment and evidences of cultural friction. It is, rather, to point to the fact that the acute character and specific form in which these types of personal and social disorganization plague us today derive largely from the present stage of industrialization and urbanization processes by no means yet complete.

A disproportionate share of the personal and social disorganization of the city is generally to be found among the newcomers to the urban environment and particularly among the second generation of newcomers who are most directly confronted with the culture conflict generated, on the one hand by their link to the traditional patterns of their parents and, on the other, to their exposure to their new urban environment. It is the immigrant or the in-migrant to the city who is most directly faced with the difficult problem of adjustment to urban living-problems involving conflict, accomodation and assimilation over a span not only of years but, more realistically, decades, and even generations. Much has been learned in the experience of the Western World and especially in the Americas about the problems of aculturation and assimilation in the urban setting. 44/ Similar problems are in evidence among the in-migrant populations to Asian cities.

Physical Problems

An important focus of many urban problems is to be found in some of the physical problems of the city, especially those relating to the urban residential plant. Cities tend to have definite patterns in respect to the quality and desirability of residential areas. Growing outward from a center, the older and

obsolescent housing tends to be located in the inner zones of the city; the newer and more desirable residences towards the peripheries and in the suburban area. In the competition for residential location in the Western urban setting, the population tends to be distributed in space in accordance with this pattern with the lower social economic groups in the inner zones and the higher economic strata in the outer zones of the city. It is in the inner zones that urban slums are found and all of the acute social problems associated with the city slum. 45/

In the experience of the West, the slum was often regarded as the more or less inevitable cost of economic development which produced the highest mass standard of living in Europe and America ever achieved in human history. More recently, however, the economically developed countries have increasingly intervened into the "natural" and competitive processes which produced the slum and they are attempting not only to eradicate slums but, also, to prevent them in the future through orderly city and regional planning processes.

Elsewhere in this seminar, attention will be devoted to a highly significant and special aspect of urban problems, namely that relating to housing. This is still an acute problem in cities of the more developed nations as well as in the cities of Asia.

In general, the physical problems of the city centering largely on the two foci of land use and circulation, are being increasingly faced in more developed countries by means of regional and city planning and special efforts at slum clearance and "urban renewal." Much of this effort represents the allocation of energy to alleviate and ameliorate the consequences of past developments. In the experience of some of the countries of the West, and especially the United States, city growth and urbanization were so unprecedented and so rapid that it is doubtful that planning mechanisms, had they existed, would have been able to cope with the task. 46/

It is not possible, within the limits of this paper, to deal with all of the aspects and problems of urbanization in relation to social change. What has been presented is intended to serve largely as a general framework within which the large host of specific problems may be approached and understood.

Population Growth

One impact of urbanism, however, which has a special significance, both socially and in relation tc economic development, is that which relates to the effect of the urban way of life on population growth. The basic changes in the way of life and value systems in the development of Western cities and urbanization have resulted in significant declines in birth rates which, prior to World War II, gave many of the more economically advanced countries reason to become concerned about stationary or even declining populations. Although the post-war marriage and baby boom in Western countries has deferred this apprehension, at least for the time being, the fact is that the urban way of life in the West has produced great declines in fertility to match the gains in mortality and bring about a new equilibrium in population growth.

The major objective of economic development in Asia is, of course, the raising of the level of living. The level of living of a nation, however, can be raised only if its aggregate product increases more rapidly than its population; and since gains ir mortality have historically accompanied the initial stages of economic development, while fertility persisted at high levels, rapidly growing populations threaten to defeat the objectives of raising living levels. It is against this background that the role of the city in depressing fertility rates, potentially has significant implications for economic development in Asia. 47/

Diffusion of Urbanism

There remains now only the task of indicating that the basic social changes attendant upon city life and increased urbanization did not remain confined within limits of city boundaries. Urbanism, as a way of life, has spread rapidly in all of the economically advanced countries, not only to the hinterland areas of metropolitan centers, but throughout the nation. The difference between urban and rural life has been steadily diminishing and this trend may be expected to continue. The urban way of life may be expected to spread, not only as a manifestation of social change, but as a continuous source of innovation and center of cultural diffusion that will dominate the life of the entire nation. 48/

Urbanization and Social Change—Summary

The more developed nations in the course of a century and a half have witnessed the rise of great metropolitan centers and have become highly urbanized. The rapid industrialization and urbanization which they experienced was the result of a major technological and economic revolution. The major changes in the nature of the physical and economic environment produced great strains and stresses on various elements of the social heritage of the West and altered the nature of inter-personal relations and of human thought and behavior. The rapidly changing material aspects of Western culture produced great changes in the non-material elements of culture with attendant frictions and strains manifest in social and personal disorganization. Many of the social problems associated with the city may be viewed as the result of the adaptation of traditional social heritage to the new technology and economic structure produced by industrialization and the emergence of the city. The problems of urbanization, personal and social, are thus symptoms of the frictions produced by the differential rates of change in the social heritage. They represent a stage in social change, the end result of which will be social reorganization and a different social order.

This perspective does not necessarily mean that there is nothing that can be done to ameliorate or to prevent many social and personal problems. The adjustments necessary to achieve an integrated and consistent social heritage can conceivably be attained in time through "natural" processes—through the forces which produce the "strain toward consistency" in our culture. This process of social evolution is perhaps something paralleling the biological "struggle for existence" and the "survival of the fittest" in respect to culture traits and culture complexes.

Unlike the rest of the animal kingdom, however, man has it within his power to speed up the social evolutionary process—to accelerate the adjustment of social and political institutions and ideologies to the new requirements forced by technological and structural change. Indeed, one of the most important influences of urbanization lies in the emancipation of the person from the rigidities and restraints imposed upon him by tradition—in the new opportunity—in large measure forced upon him by the nature of urban existence—to be a rational animal and to intervene in the processes of social change so as to exert some control over its tempo and its direction.

The more economically advanced nations have in varying measures availed themselves of this opportunity. For example, "the natural" processes, through which the city has grown, are being increasingly subjected to the interventionism and interference of city and regional planning and to various regional and national measures designed to enhance the welfare of the nation as a whole and to provide specific forms of protection to those most directly confronted with the frictions of social change.

It is one of the paradoxes of urban life that increased freedom in the city environment often is attained only through increased restraints— that is through the increased interventionism of private or governmental agencies into the social and political process. Intelligent social planning is a device for effecting integration, coordination, cohesion and order within the urban setting or in the largely urbanized nation. It is a social invention necessitated, on the one hand, by the new problems created by the city, and, on the other, by the rapid deterioration in the urban environment of some of the elements of the pre-urban traditional social heritage.

It is a happy combination of circumstances that the same urban environment which is breaking down inherited systems of social and political organization and traditional patterns of conduct and thought is also producing the means whereby a new order can be welded better adapted to the changed technology and economic structure. An increasing awareness of this happy combination of circumstances would undoubtly accelerate the process of cultural adjustment which still confronts the West as well as Asia.

IMPLICATIONS FOR ASIA

The preceding sections on "Urbanization in Relation to Economic Development" and on "Urbanization in Relation to Social Change and Social Problems" have been presented as a background against which to assay the present and future prospects of urbanization in Asia. It has already been emphasized that it would be risky to assume that the patterns observed in the West necessarily apply to Asia. On the contrary, there are many reasons why it is more logical to assume that urbanization in Asia may involve quite different inter-relationships with economic development, on the one hand, and social change and social problems, on the other. These reasons include the many differences between the situation at the present time, when Asia is attempting to accelerate industrialization and economic development, and the situation one to two centuries ago when the European and American nations experienced the industrial revolution.

Differences Between Asia and the West

Among these differences are: basic differences arising from the fact that present urban development in Asia is largely an outgrowth of a century or more of colonialism, and in large measure, reflects the troubled conditions of post-war adjustment and newly won independence; differences in the extent to which central planning and government interventionism, as contrasted with the free market economy, may be expected to operate in Asian economic development; differences in the state of industrial and agricultural technology in the 20th, as contrasted with the 18th and 19th centuries; the differences in the ratio of population to resources and the availability of open lands for surplus population emigration; the differences in basic outlook and value systems between Asia and the West; and the significant differences in the total world situation—economic, social and political, at the present time as contrasted with the 18th and 19th centuries.

Colonial heritage To begin with, as a result of the colonial heritage, many of the countries of Asia, and especially Southeast Asia, have an urban development

which is the product of colonial rather than indigenous economic organization. In consequence, many of the countries in Asia are characterized by one great metropolis, 'the primate city', a great city which dominates the urban situation.[49] The "great city" tends to be from 5 to 10 times as large as the next largest city, and there is no system of cities in keeping with the pattern described in the more economically advanced countries. The "great city" owed its origin and growth to its function as a "head-link" between the West, typically the mother colonial power and the indigenous order. These cities tend to be "parasitic" in the sense that they tended to obstruct economic growth in their country of location by retarding the development of other cities in the nation, by contributing little to the development of their own hinterland, by being oriented primarily toward the contribution of services to the colonial power abroad or the colonial or indigenous elite in the great city itself. The great cities which were products of the colonial period or served primarily as a link for a local elite with the outside world, cannot be regarded as products of industrialization and economic development in the same sense as has been described for Western cities.

Moreover, many of the characteristics of the great cities of Asia and Southeast Asia are at variance with the patterns observed in the West. For example, although they have large size, high density, and often heterogeneous populations, these characteristics of the urban environment have not produced the basic changes in interpersonal relations, the nature of human nature, and the social institutions [illegible] in their Western context.

Although the large cities in Asia have great size, their pluralistic composition and characteristic dual economies have enabled indigenous groups to live under essentially "folk" conditions within the boundaries of the city. Despite their relatively high densities, life has not necessarily become largely secularized, great differentiation of functions has not taken place and the way of life has not changed markedly for many of the indigenous population groups. Finally, despite the great heterogeneity of the population in many of these cities, both exogenous and indigenous ethnic groups, little has occurred in the way of increased sophistication, rationality in behavior, cosmopolitanism of outlook, or innovation and social change. In large measure, the problems--social and personal--in the great cities of Asia,

derive not so much from "urbanism as a way of life" but reflect rather the problems of the nation at large, problems arising largely from low productivity and mass poverty.[51]

The physical patterning of the Asian city does not parallel that of the European or American city. Although inner zones of Asian cities often do contain areas of blight and slum, especially in the "native quarters", many of the great cities of Asia have large native "kampangs" at their peripheries. This has been true especially recently because of refugee in-migration produced by unsettled conditions in the countryside. But it nevertheless, poses a difficult problem of housing and city planning and adjustment of refugee populations to urban living.

Furthermore, the large refugee populations now in many Asian cities provide, not only serious problems calling for immediate attention from the standpoint of health, safety and welfare, but constitute, also, a drag on efforts at economic development. Many of the cities of Asia, for example, Karachi, Calcutta, and Rangoon, have swelled populations that reflect troubled times rather than economic development; and the necessity to deal with refugee populations competes in a fundamental sense with efforts to induce economic development. The post-war refugee population, in fact, tends to augment the problems created by in-migration from rural areas arising not so much from economic development and "pull" factors in the city, as from the "push" factors in the poverty ridden, over-populated rural areas. Many Asian cities at the present time represent "over-urbanization", a condition which Davis demonstrated for Egypt.[52]

Central planning vs. market mechanism. Another basic difference in the development of Asian cities that may be anticipated, is that arising from the extent to which central planning and government intervention in economic development of city growth characterize the Asian scene. For a number of reasons, historical and contemporary, central government planning and management in economic affairs and in urbanization will be more important and the play of the market economy will be less important in economic development and urbanization in Asia than it was in the West.[53] In consequence, both the development of individual cities and systems of cities in Asia may not follow Western historical patterns.

In increasing the mix of central planning and government interventionism, it is possible that many of the problems of Western industrialization and urbanization may be avoided or ameliorated. But it must be emphasized that it is also possible that new and serious types of problems will be encountered. The inter-play of factors most conducive to efficient and balanced economic development and orderly urbanization is far from being fully understood. In Western development, ignorance of these factors was compensated for largely by the play of the market mechanism through which differentiation of function, spatial arrangement, resource allocation, and economic development were largely achieved. In Asia, in the lack of a full understanding of the economics of development and urbanization, government planning and administration of important sectors of the economy and the direction of various aspects of urbanization may conceivably lead to less efficient organization and more serious problems than those experienced in the West. Certainly what little is known of the experience of the countries which have employed central planning indicates that central planning and direction in economic development is by no means free of serious economic, social and political problems.[54]

Twentieth century technology. The growth of cities in Asia under 20th century conditions with 20th century technology, as contrasted with the 19th century technology available to Europe and America during their rapid periods of industrialization and urbanization, may also produce different patterns of development in Asian, as compared with Western, cities. For one thing, there is available for industrialization and spatial arrangement of plant and population in Asia, electric power as well as steam power, so that cities can simultaneously, rather than sequentially, experience centrifugal and centripetal forces, respectively. Morever, Asia in her economic development can now utilize developments in eletronics and automation and may conceivable also be affected by the availability of the atom as a source of power. Asian industry can adopt 20th century technology, as indeed is actually being done in many instances, without necessarily replicating the various stages in Western historical development.

Another technological factor which may produce differences in both industrialization and urbanization in Asia, as compared with the West, is that arising from differences in agricultural technology. Agricultural technology in

the West at the beginning of rapid industrial development was in a more advanced stage than that in Asia at the present time. It may well be that a major limiting factor in both urbanization and industrialization in Asia may be low agricultural productivity per head. In any case, it is clear that balanced economic development will require increased capital expenditures in agriculture as well as in industry. Moreover, even though the case for labour intensive, rather than capital intensive industrial development is a strong one in Asian economic development, it is certain that increased productivity per head in agriculture will be a prerequisite to balanced economic development, in general.[55/]

Population in relation to resources. A problem closely related to agricultural productivity, which also represents a significant difference between Asia and the West in respect of industrialization and urbanization, is that relating to differences in ratio of population to resources. At the beginning of rapid industrialization in the West, as compared with the situation in Asia today, population was relatively sparse in relation to resources. Moreover, with the demographic revolution which accompanied the industrial revolution, manifested in unprecedentedly rapid population growth, surplus Western populations had available for settlement vast unexploited and relatively uninhabited continents. In contrast, Asia today is on the whole characterized by very high ratios of population to resources and is experiencing the initial impact of economic development in death rates which are decreasing more rapidly than in Western experience with consequent rapidly increasing populations. Rapid population increase in Asia may actually threaten efforts to raise levels of living, whereas in the West, in a quite different situation, rapid population increase probably accelerated economic development.[56/]

Ideology and values. Another difference between Asia and the West which may affect industrialization and urbanization, is that in basic ideology, outlook and value systems as represented, for example, in the differences between the Protestant ethic on the one hand, and the Hindu, Buddhist and Islamic traditions on the other. It has been argued by a number of scholars that a prerequisite to Western economic development has been the value system of the West, particularly as exemplified in the "Protestant ethic".[57/] It is in the Western outlook, characterized by rationalism,

a willingness and ability to defer immediate gratification for more desirable later ones, an emphasis on achievement and success as distinguished from status and prestige, a cosmopolitan as distinguished from a parochial outlook, and an impersonal and utilitarian as distinguished from a personal and sentimental basis for inter-personal relations that some students trace a basic difference in the economic achievements of the West and the East.[58]

It is, of course, a highly debatable matter as to whether the Western outlook, so characterized, is an antecedent or a consequent of industrialization and urbanization, or something of both; and also as to whether this outlook, or each element of it, really is an essential ingredient of economic development. It is conceivable that the differences between Asian and Western outlook may produce somewhat different types of industrialization and urbanization, or inter-personal and social relations arising therefrom. It is also conceivable that much of what has been written on this subject is the product of premature generalization based on limited observation of Western experience.

World situation. Finally, differences in patterns of industrialization and urbanization between Asia and the West may derive from significant differences in the total world situation, economic, social and political, at the present time as compared with that at the outset of Western industrialization. Among these differences which may be relevant are the bi-polar conflict of the "Communist" and the "Free" worlds in respect to ideology and economic, social and political organization; the practically universal desire of all peoples to achieve high levels of living; the wane of colonialism; the existence of the United Nations and its specialized agencies; the impact of technical assistance through the international organizations and through various other programmes--multilateral and unilateral, government and private. These and other basic differences in the world situation may lead to quite different patterns in urbanization and industrialization.

Concluding observations. These are among the considerations which call for emphasizing the need for caution in using Western experience as a basis for essaying Asian urban development. They point also to the need for broadening the universe of urban research to obtain generalizations about urbanization that have world wide

rather than European and American empirical basis. Wirth was among those who recognized the dangers of premature generalization about urbanization based on inadequate observation. Addressing himself largely to the "urban-rural" dichotomy as observed in the Western World, in a recently published posthumous volume, he wrote:

> "To set up ideal-typical polar concepts as I have done, and many others before me have done, has not proved that city and country are fundamentally and necessarily different. It does not justify mistaking the hypothetical characteristics attributed to the urban and rural modes of life for established facts, as has so often been done. Rather it suggests certain hypotheses to be tested in the light of empirical evidence which we must assiduously gather. Unfortunately, this evidence has not been accumulated in such a fashion as to test critically any major hypothesis that has been proposed".59/

Wirth's injunction is as applicable to efforts to project Western patterns of city growth to Asia as to the premature generalization about urban-rural differences. Differences between the way of life in the Western and Asian cities may mean that quite different types of social changes than those observed in the West may be associated with economic development in Asia.

Despite the limitations of the experience of the West for essaying and predicting the future of urbanization in Asia, there are, nevertheless, a number of things in the Western experience from which Asian nations may profit. For example, it is clear that if the countries of Asia are successful in their efforts to accelerate industrialization, both the number of cities and urbanization will increase. These developments will almost inevitably create new problems, economic and social.

Many of the high costs, frictions and problems of Western industrialization and city growth can conceivably be ameliorated or avoided in Asian planned development. Of special interest in this connexion may be the planning of the physical structure of cities with special reference to the problem of urban housing. Worthy of mention is the opportunity of Asian governments relatively early in the game, to make provision for local government which coincides with the realities of urban demographic and economic entities, rather than with accidental, historical, political units. It may also be mentioned that with the increased role of planning in Asian economics and the development of conscious nation-building goals among the mass

population, it may be possible to mobilize the people of Asian cities actively to co-operate in the achievement of development goals. For example, the possibility of utilizing the expanding community development programmes in urban centres as well as villages, is certainly worth consideration.[60]

In general, Asia can be and is, more mindful, than was the West, of personal and community hardships arising from industrialization and urbanization. The extent to which these problems can be ameliorated, however. is another matter because of limited resources and the difficult decisions which must be faced in respect of social, as compared with productive, capital investment.

On the basis of Western experience, Asian countries would do well to anticipate that increased industrialization and urbanization are likely to produce significant cultural changes and changes in personal behaviour and thought.[61] Although it is hazardous to say that these changes will be of the same character as those observed in Western countries, it is probably safe to say that some change, and probably basic change, will occur. This may have a special significance for Asian countries, at the present time, when, having recently won independence from the colonial powers, many are experiencing a resurgent nationalism and placing great emphasis on the pre-colonial, traditional way of life. Economic development, particularly in the form of industrialization with attendant urbanization, is almost certain to conflict with the return to, or retention of, many of the traditional forms of thought and behaviour.

There is still considerable confusion about the inter-relations of ideology and value systems and economic development. The extreme positions have been stated historically by Hegel and Marx, respectively. Most scholars probably would subscribe to the notion that changes in the material and non-material culture are inter-related and that neither one is a simple consequent of the other. Few, if any, would hold that the technological and economic base of the society can change without profoundly affecting the non-material cultural base.

In summary, then, although the Western experience with industrialization and urbanization cannot be used as a basis for assaying or predicting the present status of urbanization in Asia or predicting its future course, it may, nevertheless, provide valuable experience in guiding economic development and city growth.

Particularly is this true in light of the fact that for a variety of reasons, government and central planning in Asia are inevitably going to play a more prominent role in the economic development than they did in the history of the Western countries.

FOOTNOTES

1. The statistics relating to cities and urbanization in the world and by continent except as otherwise indicated are drawn from the forthcoming volume by Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz, The Pattern of World Urbanization (Macmillan). Grateful acknowledgement is made of the co-operation of the authors in making these data available for the Seminar.

2. V. Gordon Childe, Man Makes Himself, London: Watts, 1941, Chapters v-vi; and What Happened in History, London and New York: Penguin Books, 1946, Chapters iii-iv; and N.S.B. Gras, An Introduction to Economic History, New York: Harper, 1922; See also Kingsley Davis, "The Origin and Growth of Urbanization in the World," The American Journal of Sociology Vol.LX, No. 5, March 1955, special issue on World Urbanism, Philip M. Hauser (ed.), pp. 429-437.

3. Bert F. Hoselitz, "The Role of Cities in the Economic Growth of Underdeveloped Countries," Journal of Political Economy, Vol. LXI, No. 3, June 1953, pp. 201 ff.

4. Kingsley Davis, op. cit.; and Kingsley Davis and Hilda Hertz Golden,"Urbanization and the Development of Pre-Industrial Areas," Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 1, October 1954, pp. 6-24. For urbanization during the 19th Century, see A. F. Weber, The Growth of Cities in the Nineteenth Century, New York, 1899.

5. Davis and Golden, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

6. Ibid., p.8

7. Ibid., p. 10

8. Ibid., p. 11

9. Ibid., p. 11

10. Ibid., p. 11

11. United Nations, Demographic Yearbook, 1955, United Nations, New York, 1955, p.16

12. United States Bureau of the Census, United States Census of Population 1950, Vol. I, Number of Inhabitants, United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1952, pp. xxvii, xxx, xxiii.

13. United Nations, op. cit., pp. 16-17.

14. Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life" in Community Life and Social Policy, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1956, pp. 110-132; S. A. Queen and D. B. Carpenter, The American City, New York, 1953, p. 29.

15. See "Urbanization in Relation to Social Change and Social Problems", below.

16. Eric E. Lampard, "The History of Cities in the Economically Advanced Areas", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 2, January 1955, p. 83.

17. N. S. B. Gras, op. cit.

18. Patrick Geddes, Cities in Evolution, London, 1915. As Lampard points out, Geddes corresponding terms are "eotechnic", "paleotechnic" and "neotechnic".

19. Because Lampard presents the best short summary of the relation of industrialization to urbanization which the writer has seen, his materials are mainly employed in this section to present to the Seminar what the writer regards as the most relevant body of historical and economic generalizations based on western experience.

20. The quotations in this paragraph are from Lampard, op.cit., p. 103.

21. Hoselitz believes that the study of cities in medieval Europe may "shed important light on the over-all conditions and processes of economic development" and that there are many parallels "between the European middle ages and presently underdeveloped countries", op. cit., p. 203.

22. Lampard, op. cit., p. 105.

23. E.g., L. Marshall, "The Emergence of the First Industrial City: Manchester, 1780-1850" in C. F. Ware, Cultural Approach to History; and J. Ogden, Description of Manchester, cited by Lampard, op. cit., pp. 105 ff.

24. Lampard, op. cit., p. 116.

25. Ibid., p. 123

26. N. S. B. Gras, op. cit.; R. D. McKenzie, The Metropolitan Community, New York: McGraw Hill, 1933; D. J. Bogue, the Structure of the Metropolitan Community, University of Michigan, 1950.

27. Rutledge Vining, "A Description of Certain Spatial Aspects of an Economic System," Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 2, January 1955, pp. 147-195. Contains references to other literature and good summary of aspects of it, as well.

28. Ibid., p. 148. The formula for the rank size rule is $^{S}R = \frac{S_1}{R}$ where S_1 is size of largest city, R the rank in size of a given city, and ^{S}R the size of a city having rank R. This produces the Pareto "greater-than" frequency distribution of cities classified by size.

29. Ibid., p. 153 ff. based on work of Carl H. Madden.

30. A. Lösch, The Economics of Location, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1955. See discussion by Wolfgang Stolper, "Spatial Order and the Economic Growth of Cities: A Comment on Eric Lampard's Paper," Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 2, January 1955, pp. 137-146.

31. W. Christaller, Die Zentralen Orte in Suddentschland, Jena, 1933. See also Vining (footnote 27) which contains summary of aspects of Christaller.

32. Lampard, op. cit., p. 82.

33. Ibid., p. 88-91 for quotations in this paragraph.

34. Ibid., p. 92.

35. Ibid., p. 95.

36. Ibid., p. 101.

37. ECAFE, Economic Causes and Implications of Urbanization in the Recent Experience of Countries in Asia and the Far East, 14, June, for Joint UN/UNESCO Seminar, p. 3 and 21 ff.

38. E.g., F. Tönnies, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, 1887 (or translation by C. P. Loomis, Fundamental Concepts of Sociology, New York, 1940); Emile Durkheim, On the Division of Labour in Society (translation by George Simpson), New York: Macmillan, 1933, especially Chapters 1 to 3; Robert Redfield, "Folk Society", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LII, No. 4, January 1947, pp. 293-308; Louis Wirth, op. cit., pp. 110 ff.

39. Tönnies, op. cit.

40. Wirth, op. cit., pp. 110 ff.

41. See Robert E. Park, Human Communities, Chicago: The Free Press, 1952, pp. 108 ff.

42. "Effects of Urbanization on Family Life in the ECAFE Region," United Nations paper for Seminar; W. F. Ogburn, "The Family and its Functions," Recent Social Trends in the United States, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1933, Chapter XIII; United Nations, Processes and Problems of Industrialization in Underdeveloped Countries, United Nations, New York, 1955, pp. 119 ff.

43. For general sociological treatment of social disorganization see Robert E. L. Faris, Social Disorganization, New York: Ronald Press, 1948, or Mabel A. Elliot and Francis E. Merrill, Social Disorganization, New York and London: Harper and Brothers, 1951. See Also paper prepared for Seminar on Urbanization and Crime by Bureau of Social Affairs, United Nations.

44. E.g., see International Union for the Scientific Study of Population, Cultural Assimilation of Immigrants, London: Cambridge University Press, 1950; Robert E. Park, Race and Culture, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950, especially pp. 345 ff.; Philip M. Hauser, "Demography and Ecology in Relation to Social Work", chapter in forthcoming publication of Annual Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work, St. Louis, 1956.

45. E. g., see N. P. Gist and L. A. Halbert, Urban Society, New York: Crowell Co., 1956, especially Chapters 5, 7, 23; Swend Riemer, The Modern City, New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952, Chapters 5, 6, 16; E. E. Bergel, Urban Sociology, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955, Chapters 5, 20, 21.

46. Miles Colean, Renewing Our Cities, New York, Twentieth Century Fund, 1953; Coleman Woodbury (ed.), The Future of Cities and Urban Redevelopment, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953; Coleman Woodbury (ed.), Urban Redevelopment: Problems and Practices, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953; National Resources Committee, Our Cities, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1937.

47. United Nations, The Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends, New York, United Nations, 1953, Part III, pp. 181 ff.

48. Robert E. Park, Human Communities, pp. 128 ff.; Louis Wirth, op. cit., p. 110 ff.

49. Mark Jefferson, "The Law of the Primate City", Geographical Review, April, 1939; Norton S. Ginsberg, "The Great City in Southeast Asia", American Journal of Sociology, special issue on World Urbanism, P. M. Hauser (ed), Vol. LX, No. 5, March 1955, pp. 455-462.

50. Bert F. Hoselitz, "Generative and Parasitic Cities", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 3, April 1955, p. 279.

51. UNESCO, The Social Implications of Industrialization and Urbanization, Calcutta: UNESCO, 1956; United Nations, Preliminary Report on the World Social Situation, New York: United Nations, 1952, especially Chapter XII.

52. Davis and Golden, op. cit., pp. 16 ff.; also ECAFE, op. cit., p. 10.

53. United Nations, Processes and Problems of Industrialization in Under-Developed Countries, New York: United Nations, 1955, pp. 51 ff.; also Philip M. Hauser, "Freedom and Planning: A Real Antinomy?" Cultural Freedom in Asia, Congress for Cultural Freedom, Tokyo: Tuttle Co., 1956, pp. 181-186; N. S. Buchanan and H. S. Ellis, Approaches to Economic Development, New York: Twentieth Fund, 1955; Simon Kuznets, "Towards a Theory of Economic Growth", Columbia University, Mimeo. (1955); J. J. Spengler, "Theories of Socio-Economic Growth", Problems in the Study of Economic Growth, National Bureau Committee on Economic Research (Mimeo. 1949); Bert F. Hoselitz (ed), Agrarian Societies in Transition, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 305, May 1956.

54. United Nations. op. cit., pp. 71 ff.; also Everett Hagen, "World Economic Trends and Living Standards", in P. M. Hauser (ed), Population and World Politics (forthcoming volume, University of Chicago Press), especially discussion on China and India; also ECAFE, Economic Development Policies in Relation to Types, Scale and Location of Industries as a Factor Likely to Influence Urbanization Trends in ECAFE Countries, Joint UN/UNESCO Seminar on Urbanization in the ECAFE Region (mimeo.).

55. United Nations, op.cit., pp. 69 ff.; Lampard, op. cit., p. 131 ff.; T. W. Shultz "Food and Agriculture in a Developing Economy", T. W. Shultz (ed), Food for the World, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 306-320.

56. United Nations, Determinants and Consequences of Population Trends, Chapters XIII, XIV, XV; United Nations, Proceedings of the World Population Conference, Summary Report, New York: United Nations, 1955, especially Summary Reports of meetings 20, 22, 24 and 26.

57. E.g., Werner Sombart, Religion and the Rise of Capitalism, London and New York, 1926; Max Weber, The Protestant Ethnic and the Spirit of Capitalism (translated by Talcott Parsons), London: Allen and Unwin, 1930.

58. Talcott Parsons has set up a conceptual scheme of the "pattern alternatives of value-orientation". These focus on the "relational aspects of the role structure of the social system". They include the following five alternatives.

I. The Gratification-Discipline Dilemma: Affectivity vs. Affective Neutrality.
II. The Private vs. Collective Interest Dilemma: Self-Orientation vs. Collectivity-Orientation.
III. The Choice Between Types of Value-Orientation Standard: Universalism vs. Particularism.
IV. The Choice Between "Modalities" of the Social Object: Achievement vs. Ascription.
V. The Definition of Scope of Interest in the Object: Specificity vs. Diffuseness.

This scheme is presented here because it is increasingly appearing in the literature with a minimum of explanation and sometimes as if it represented a substantive generalization based on empirical research rather than a "relational" classification scheme for possible use in research. For example, the "major normative and belief systems" of the American city have been described as pervaded by "value-orientations of affective-neutrality, specificity, achievement, and universalism". (Kolb—see reference below, p. 34). The same author (Kolb) also says "it is important to know that value orientations constituted by the same pattern variables functioned yesterday and function today to maintain our industrial society as a going concern". (p. 35)

Hoselitz has also utilized the pattern variables in his attempts to deal with the relation of value systems to economic development in the following passage:

> "Kolb has shown that the formation of the western city, of which Chicago was chosen as the prototype, was associated with a transformation of a particularistic-ascriptive value orientation to an universalistic-achievement oriented one. He also argues that the process of urbanization in underdeveloped countries, in order to be successful, must follow a similar pattern. This argument is in agreement with views I expressed in a recent article on the social-structural change associated with a transition from economic underdevelopment to economic advancement. However, I confined my analysis there only to 'those sets of action systems which pertain to a description of economically relevant behaviour, ie. behavious related to the production and distribution of goods and services'. Moreover, I included in the analysis not merely the ascription-achievement and the universalism-particularism dichotomies but also a consideration of the other three pairs of pattern variables stipulated by Parsons, particularly the specificity-diffuseness dichotomy. This last pair of variables is stressed by Lampard in his analysis of division of labour and increasing specialization. Its addition appears to me important because, in general, there exists a close functional correlation between ascription, particularism and functional diffuseness on the one hand, and achievement, universalism, and functional specificity, on the other. But although such a close functional relation between each pair of pattern variables may be stipulated for a given area of social action, e.g., economic activity or political activity, it is not necessary that in the same society all fields of social action display the same structural variables. It is conceivable that economic relations, for example, are ruled by principles of achievement, universalism, and functional specificity, but that political relations display the principles of ascription, particularism, and functional diffuseness".

This passage, unnecessarily heavy in language, raises a number of questions which cannot be treated here. It should be pointed out, however, that if these "relational" value-orientation patterns are to be considered substantively, the quotation embodies the following debatable assumptions:

(1) that urbanization and industrialization in Asia must necessarily follow the same pattern as that described for the West in respect of value orientations; (2) that the value orientation scheme described actually represents empirically demonstrated generalizations for the West; (3) that the classification scheme is more than one of a number of arbitrary classification schemes which might be used for what Parsons presumably intended as a potentially heuristic scheme.

See Talcott Parsons, The Social System, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951, pp. 58-67 and pp. 182-91; William L. Kolb, "The Social Structure and Functions of Cities", Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. III, No. 1, October 1954; Bert F. Hoselitz, "Generative and Parasitic Cities", loc. cit., p.

59. Louis Wirth, "Rural-Urban Differences", in Louis Wirth, op. cit., p. 173-74. Among the increasing number of critics of the urban-rural and folk-rural dichotomies or continua are: Oscar Lewis, Life in a Mexican Village, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1951, pp. 432-436; Gideon Sjoberg, "The Pre-Industrial City", American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LX, No. 5, March 1955, pp. 438-445 (special issue on World Urbanism); William L. Kolb, op. cit., pp. 37 ff.; Otis Dudley Duncan and Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Social Characteristics of American Rural and Urban Communities: 1950 (forthcoming volume, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1956).

60. United Nations, Social Progress Through Community Development, New York: United Nations, 1955.

61. E.g., see "Document for the Seminar on Urbanization", Department of Cultural Activities, UNESCO [Agenda Item 3 (b)].